

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT,  
DISTRICT OF UTAH.

Michael Ames,

Plaintiff,

FILED  
U.S. DISTRICT COURT

2013 MAR 20 A 11:59

DISTRICT OF UTAH

BY:

DEPUTY CLERK

Reply To Defendants  
Response -

VS,

Todd Christensen,

Defendants.

Judge Dec Benson

Case No # 2:12-CV-481-DB.

Ob. Tective Reply To Defendants Excusable  
Neglect To Disregard Original Order Of The Court:

Come Now Plaintiff Michael Ames  
Who Respectfully Reply To The  
Defendants Mat Factor Response  
Regarding Defendants Position Of  
Civil Default.

Plaintiff disagrees With Defendants  
Plea To Excusable Neglect For disregarding  
The order and Demand of The Court To  
Respond by December 12, 2012,

And That The Courts Order To Locate  
and Summons The Response To The Complaint  
by The Defendant,

Did Indeed Give Defendant Sufficient  
Time Which To Demonstrate His Rebuttal.

Therefore Plaintiff would Respectfully  
move The Court For Non-consideration Of  
Defendants Pleading To Disregard The  
Demands of The Courts Original Order.

## Reply To Response -

(1). Defendants attempt To Supersede The Constitutions and Civil Laws When The Defendant Vociferously or With Disrespectful Arrogance Refused To answer The Issues Raised IN Plaintiff's Civil Complaint,

Therefore The Court may view Defendants waiver To answer The Issues Raised IN This Civil Complaint, As Defendants own Position To Concede That all The allegations are True and Correct, And That Defendant Did Indeed Commit all The acts alleged against Him IN This Civil Complaint.

(2). Defendants only Response Argument Is That He Should be given Immunity because His actions Did NOT Violate or Offend The Law -

Because The Defendant Is a Trained Veteran Detective, and Therefore Was Completely aware That Plaintiff Was already IN Police Custody When Defendant Shot Him IN The Back 3 Times,

And More Important Defendant Has Several Prior misconduct Complaints against Him, Where Civil Rights Violations were also alleged against him, Thus Lack of Knowledge of Law Is UNEXCUSABLE Defense.

## Reply To Response -

(3). Defendant argues That Prison Litigations To Exhaust all administrative Remedies Preclude Plaintiff From The Civil action Relief He Seeks -

This argument by Defendant Indeed Disregards The plain Language argued In Plaintiff's Complaint, That This Is an External offense Committed by The Reckless act of The Defendant, And The UTAH Department of Institutional operations IS IN NO Way Related To The City Police Department,

Therefore IT would be Improper Procedure To file a Grievance In Prison against The Defendant.

(4). Plaintiff's Complaint Is Replete with His Request for Relief From Pain and Suffering Caused by The Defendant -

Therefore The Defendant's 3rd argument For Defense Fails on IT's Face, Because IT IS UNTRUE and Misleading.

## Reply To Response -

(5). Defendants 4<sup>th</sup> and 5<sup>th</sup> arguments of Defense attempts to Ignore The Medical Records and Record account of The Reckless acts Committed by The Defendant against Plaintiff -

Therefore Plaintiff again Move The Court To Dismiss Defendants Response as Frivolous and without Merit on Its Face.

(6). The Defendants Response That IT would Violated The 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment for The Court To Grant Plaintiffs Due Relief Is an absolute oversight of The Protected Constitutional Rights of Every Citizen which Prevents Civil Rights Violation That Causes undue Pain and Suffering;

However In This Civil Complaint Case, The Defendant DID INDEED Cause The undue Pain and Suffering upon The Plaintiffs Civil Liberty Interest.

## Conclusion-

Pleading at which There are Civil Liberty Interest at Issues in The Complaint,

The Defendant is NOT afforded The Immunity From answering The allegations of offenses alleged against Him,

Therefore Plaintiff would now move The Court to view The Defendant's Response as His Position To Concede To The allegations against Him as True and Correct.

Plaintiff would also Respectfully move The Court to set This Case Matter before The Court's Calendar on a motion For a Resolution Hearing, Whereas both Parties may Respectfully Resolve To Settle This Case in The Interest of Justice,

Also Plaintiff move The Court For an order of appearance For Good Cause Shown.

March 13, 2013

Page No #5

Respectfully  
Submitted by  
Michael Arnes

